

Appl. No.: 09/837,995  
Amdt. dated May 7, 2004  
Reply to Office action of February 27, 2004

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Receipt of the Office Action dated February 27, 2004 is hereby acknowledged. In that Action the Examiner: 1) indicated several Examiner's amendments to the specification and claims; 2) objected to the Declarations originally submitted; 3) objected to Figure 2; 4) indicated allowance of claim 13; 5) objected to claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; and 6) provisionally rejected the remaining claims for alleged obviousness-type double patenting.

With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 6-8 and 13-14. Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims are allowable, and respectfully requests reconsideration.

#### **I. AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION**

With this Response, Applicants amend the specification in several locations. The amendment to paragraph [0005] (the amendments shown with respect to the Examiner's amendment noted in the Office Action dated February 27, 2004) corrects the serial number of the related case, and also notes the patent number. The amendment to paragraph [0012] is to correct a grammatical deficiency. The amendment to paragraphs [0032] and [0034] are to avoid any misinterpretation regarding what was known at the time of filing of the case in relation to the various embodiments, and as for [0034] alone, to add the patent number of the related case. No new matter is submitted by these amendments.

#### **II. REQUIREMENT FOR A NEW DECLARATION**

In the Office Action dated February 27, 2004, the Examiner objects to the Declaration alleging:

It does not identify the city and either state or foreign country of residence of each inventor. **The residence information may be provided on either on [sic] an application data sheet or a supplemental oath or declaration.**


Office Action dated February 24, 2004, paragraph 2 (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully traverse this requirement.

Appl. No.: 09/837,995  
Amdt. dated May 7, 2004  
Reply to Office action of February 27, 2004

The Declarations originally submitted, one each for each inventor, were U.S. Patent & Trademark Office forms PTO/SB/01A, and the set of Declarations was accompanied by an Application Data Sheet that set forth both the city and state of residence of each inventor. The form PTO/SB/05 Utility Patent Application transmittal noted that it accompanied an Application Data Sheet, and the return receipt post card, an image of which is shown below, acknowledges receipt of the Application Data Sheet by the Office.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

<b>APPLICANTS:</b>	Shubhendu S. MUKHERJEE et al.
<b>SERIAL NO.:</b>	NOT YET ASSIGNED
<b>FILING DATE:</b>	CONCURRENTLY HERewith
<b>CLIENT NO.:</b>	1662-36900 JMH (P00-3156)
<b>ENTITLED:</b>	Simultaneous And Redundantly Threaded Processor Store Instruction Comparator



The date stamp of the mail room of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office hereon will acknowledge receipt of a *Utility Patent Application Transmittal (1 p.) and Fee Transmittal for FY 2001 (1 p.), in duplicate; Declaration (2 p.); Application Data Sheet (2 p.); Patent Application (22 p.); TWO (2) Sheets of FORMAL Drawings (Figs. 1-2); Information Disclosure Statement (2 p.); Form PTO-1449 (1 p.); THREE (3) References; \$1,030.00 Check; and this acknowledgment postcard*, mailed by U.S. Postal Express Mail Service, Express Mail Label No. EL422465015US, postage prepaid, on April 19, 2001.

43758 01/1662.36900

RECEIVED

APR 30 2001

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a new Declaration is not needed as the requested information has already been supplied to the Office.

### III. DRAWING OBJECTION AND AMENDMENT

In the Office Action dated February 27, 2004, the Examiner objected to Figure 2 for lacking reference number 142. However, this rejection appears to be in error as both the informal drawings that accompanied the application and the formal drawings later submitted each have the reference number "142" associated with the "INIT UNIT."

Figure 2 does, however, inadvertently refer to a "RUN" element rather than a "RUU" as described in the specification. Thus, with this Response, Applicants submit a replacement drawing sheet comprising Figure 2 to correct this typographical error. Now new matter is submitted in this amendment.

#### **IV. CLAIM AMENDMENTS**

With this Response, Applicants submit several claim amendments. Applicants amend claim 1 by removing several limitations that are not needed to distinguish over the cited art. Further, Applicants remove the "adapted to" terminology of claim 1. Finally with respect to claim 1, Applicants amend the "one of ... and ..." to be "one of ... or ..." to ensure a construction that requires only one of the listed elements, and not both. Applicants amend claims 6, 7, 8 and 14 to remove the "exactly" term. Applicants remove the "only" terminology from claim 13 to avoid an interpretation that would avoid infringement if the claimed method and another method were used. Applicants further amend claim 14 to remove the "step" terminology to ensure the limitation is not construed as a step-plus-function limitation under Section 112.

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is presented by these amendments.

#### **V. PROVISIONAL DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTIONS**

In the Office Action dated February 27, 2004, the Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1, 4-5, 8-12, and 14-18 for alleged obviousness-type double patenting over co-pending application 09/839,626. No other rejections of these claims were presented.

Although Applicants disagree that read queue and compare logic of co-pending application 09/839,626 (see claim 1 of that application) would render obvious the store queue and compare logic of the present case (see claim 1 herein), in order to speed the prosecution Applicants submit concurrently herewith a terminal disclaimer with respect to pending application 09/839,626. By submission of the terminal disclaimer, all the outstanding rejections in this case are mooted, and the case is ready for allowance.

#### **VI. CONCLUSION**


Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

**Appl. No.: 09/837,995**  
**Amdt. dated May 7, 2004**  
**Reply to Office action of February 27, 2004**

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any fees or time extensions are inadvertently omitted or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Hewlett-Packard Company Deposit Account Number 08-2025 and enter any time extension(s) necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark E. Scott  
PTO Reg. No. 43,100  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400